

REMARKS

This amendment amends the specification as requested by the Examiner; cancels claims 5, 10-12, 16, and 20; amends claims 1, 6, and 13-15; and adds new claims 21 and 22. Support for the amendments to the specification is found, for example, in original claims 16-19. Support for the claim amendments is found, for example, in the canceled claims 5, 10-12, 16, and 20. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 13-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 are now present in this application.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner objected to the specification for inconsistent use of the terms "pulley" and "roller". As set forth above, Applicants have amended the specification to use these terms consistently, e.g., "tensioning pulley" and "guide roller".

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

On page four (4) of the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 4-6, 10-16, and 19-20 contain allowable subject matter. As set forth above, Applicants have canceled allowable claim 5 and have added the limitations therein to independent claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 (and claims 2-4, 6-9, 13-15, and 17-19 that depend therefrom) should now be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-4, 6-9, 13-15, and 17-19 are respectfully requested.

Applicants have also rewritten allowable claims 4 and 6 in independent form as new claims 21 and 22. Therefore, new claims 21 and 22 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by U.S. Patent No. 3,195,751 to Meyers et al. Claims 3, 9, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Meyers et al. in view of FR 1429685.

As set forth above, Applicants have taken the allowable subject matter from claim 5 and have added this subject matter to independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 (and

Application No. 10/686,014

Response to Office Action dated November 14, 2006

Paper dated February 13, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 5329-031708


rejected claims 2, 3, 7-9, 17, and 18 that depend therefrom) are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objection to the specification and the objections and rejections of the claims and allowance of all of claims 1-4, 6-9, 13-15, 17-19, 21, and 22 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 

William H. Logsdon

Registration No. 22,132

Attorney for Applicants

700 Koppers Building

436 Seventh Avenue

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Telephone: 412-471-8815

Facsimile: 412-471-4094

E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com